



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/720,790	03/06/2001	Jan Didriksen	0459-0522P	5000

2292 7590 03/18/2005

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

COSIMANO, EDWARD R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3629

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/720,790

Applicant(s)

DIDRIKSEN, JAN

Examiner

Edward R. Cosimano

Art Unit

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 March 2001.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 76-150 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 76-150 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 March 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/29/00; 3/29/01.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Applicant's claim for the benefit of an earlier filing data under 35 U.S.C. § 120 is acknowledged.

2. The drawings are objected to because

A) the following errors have been noted in the drawings:

(1) The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description, note:

(a) reference legends 212, 408, 413 & 414 of fig. 14 as this figure is disclosed in the paragraphs located between page 25, line 9, and page 29, line 15, "Fig. 14 is an illustration of ... as indicated by flash arrow 408."

(b) reference legends 123 & 124 of figs. 11 & 12 as these figures are disclosed in the paragraphs located at page 38, lines 3-20, "Fig. 11 is a flow sheet illustration of a first ... information and sortation pattern information."

(2) as can be seen in fig. 1 and from the context of the paragraph located between page 29, line 16, and page 30, line 2, "Fig. 1 illustrates subsystems and databases comprised in a system according to the invention, e.g., a system as illustrated in Fig. 14. The system comprises an OCR and/or VC subsystem 51 for OCR and/or VC capturing of an address block provided on a postal item. The system further comprises a first sortation subsystem 52 and second sortation subsystem 53. Five database systems are provided and will be explained in further detail below: a PIB (Postal installation Inhouse dataBase) database 54, a receiving database 55, a trace and track database 56, a sortation pattern database 57, and a sortation database 58. The PIB database 54, the receiving database 55, the trace and track database 56 and the sortation database 57 are database systems pre-installed at the item processing installation. Interfaces A, B, C, D, F, G, H and I are provided for exchange of information between the databases and the subsystems. For the sake of clarity, the following interfaces are not

shown in Fig. 1: interfaces between the OCR and/or VC subsystem 51 and the pre-installed databases 54, 55, 56, 57, interfaces for communication between the first sortation subsystem 52 and the second sortation subsystem 53, and interfaces for communication between first and second sortation subsystems provided at different item processing installations.”, as required by 37 CFR § 1.84(o) the features of the invention as depicted in fig. 1 should include the title legends:

- (a) “OCR or Video Coder (VC)” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 51;
- (b) “sortation subsystem 1” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 52;
- (c) “sortation subsystem 2” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 53;
- (d) “Postal installation Inhouse database (PIB)” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 54;
- (e) “receiving database” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 55;
- (f) “a trace and track database” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 56;
- (g) “sortation pattern database” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 57; and
- (h) “sortation database 58” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 58.

See also the consistent use of these designations in the paragraphs of the disclosure between page 30, line 15, and page 39, line 11, “The PIB (Postal installation Inhouse dataBase) ... scanners, weights, communication devices such as modems, and printers.”.

(3) The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description, note:

(a) reference legend 71 as disclosed in the paragraph located between page 34, line 27, and page 35, line 6, "Fig. 2 is a diagrammatic illustration of computer systems and databases ... are provided. The computer and database systems shown in Fig. 2 are linked through ethernet connections 71 , 72 and 73."

(4) as can be seen in fig. 3 and from the context of the paragraph located at page 35, lines 7-17, "Fig. 3 is a diagrammatic illustration of the sortation database 58a and an associated computer system. The database itself is labelled 80, whereas operations being carried during processing of data are illustrated by means of rectangular boxes labelled 81 , 82, 83 and 84. Processing which is being carried out when no items are being processed is indicated by a box 86. Data are received from the receiving database 55, processed at 82 and passed to the database 80. At 84, zip codes and street names are downloaded to the computer systems 61 , 62, 63, 64 of the control systems of the first and second sortation subsystems. At 83, data are requests for data from the computer systems 61, 62, 63, 64 are received, and responds are passed to those computer systems. At 81, data from the PIB database are received, and addresses are converted to unique address identification codes and passed to the database unit 58b.", as required by 37 CFR § 1.84(o) the features of the invention as depicted in fig. 3 should include the title legends:

(a) "sortation pattern database" for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 80;

(b) "no items are being processed" for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 86;

(c) "process received data" for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 82;

(d) "download zip codes" for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 84;

(e) "receives requests" for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 83; and

(f) "receive data from PIB and convert to unique address identification codes" for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 81.

(5) as can be seen in fig. 6 and from the context of the paragraph located between page 35, line 23, and page 36, line 16, "Fig. 6 is a diagrammatic illustration of an automatic sortation system. The system of Fig. 6 is appropriate to items for which an identification code and a unique address identification code has been associated. Such items may be items which have successfully been OCR- or VC-processed, as indicated by arrow 51p, items coming from another mail processing installation, as indicated by arrow 203p or IT-items, as indicated by arrow 54p. The item identification code and the unique address identification code is known and processed by an automatic processing database 87 which is preferably comprised in the database unit 58b. Sortation of items is carried out as follows: 1. An item is fed onto the sorting conveyor 204, cf. Fig. 14, while a feeding system for feeding items onto the sorting conveyor is in automatic mode, i.e. no manual entry of address data is carried out. 2. The optically readable item identification code is captured by a scanner. 3. The control system of the sortation subsystem or the sorting conveyor 204 passes a converting request to the database unit 58b which converts the item identification code to a corresponding unique address identification code. Converting is performed on the basis of data previously passed to the database unit 58b. 4. The discharge station 205 at which a given item is to be discharge is determined by means of the sortation pattern and primary and/or secondary sorting tables. If the unique address identification code corresponds to a post box, the sortation pattern is not used. In such case, the unique address

identification code is used directly with the sorting tables.”, as required by 37 CFR § 1.84(o) the feature of the invention as depicted in fig. 6 should include the title legends:

(a) “automatic processing database” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 87.

(6) as can be seen in fig. 7 and from the context of the paragraph located at page 36, lines 17-28, “When the scanner has captured the item identification code, the sortation tables are used as illustrated in Fig. 7. The item identification code is passed from the control system 61, 62 of the sorting conveyor 204 to the database unit 58b, as indicated by arrow 88. The unique address identification code is passed from the database unit 58b to the control system 61, 62 of the sorting conveyor 204 as indicated by arrow 89. The unique address identification code is looked up in the sorting tables 90, and discharged at discharge stations 205 in accordance with sortation pattern tables 91. The sortation pattern table 91 stores any and all unique address identification codes which, according to the example given above, comprises approximately 3000000 records. However, this number may be reduces by using only one unique address identification code for a plurality of address, such as, e.g., a number of apartments located in the same apartment block.”, as required by 37 CFR § 1.84(o) the features of the invention as depicted in fig. 7 should include the title legends:

(a) “sorting table” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 90; and

(b) “sorting pattern table” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 91.

(7) as can be seen in fig. 8 and from the context of the paragraph located between page 36, line 29, and page 37, line 6, “Fig. 8 is a flow sheet illustration the information flow in the system in connection with items which have been scanned by the OCR/VC-system. Due to an error or unforeseen circumstances,

it may happen that the item identification code and the associated unique address identification code has been recorded in the database unit 58b when the corresponding item is fed onto the sorting conveyor. Therefore, conversion of codes must be repeated, when data from the OCR/VC-system 51 arrive. At 95 it is determined whether the item identification code has been scanned. If this is the case a discharge station is associated to the item in question, as indicated by arrow 93 and process box 94. If the item identification has not been scanned, a signal indicating this fact is passed to the database 58b, as indicated by arrow 92.”, as required by 37 CFR § 1.84(o) the features of the invention as depicted in fig. 8 should include the title legends:

- (a) “scanned” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 95;
- (b) “N” or “NO” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 92;
- (c) “Y” or “YES” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 93; and
- (d) “associate discharge station” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 94.

(8) as can be seen in fig. 9 and from the context of the paragraph located at page 37, lines 7-32, “Fig. 9 is a flow sheet illustration an encoding procedure for items which are being manually encoded. At 101, the zip code is entered down to the most specific level possible. At 102, street name or post box is entered until the street name or post box is complete defined within the zip code entered at 101. In case the entered street name occurs more than once within the zip code entered, an operator is prompted for entering further address data. At 103, house or street number is entered. Steps 101, 102 and 103 marked by box 100 are related to the control systems of the sortation subsystems only. When step 103 has been completed, the data entered are passed to the sortation database 58, as indicated by arrow 104- The sortation database passes

information from the receiving database 55, as indicated by arrow 105, the information comprising also an indication of whether the destination location is a corporate location. If this destination location is a corporate location, a list of possible companies is passed from the sortation database, and the operator may choose the correct company from the list.

At 106, it is determined whether the address identification information passed from the sortation database is unique. If this is not the case, the process is continued at 109, arrow 107 indicating that the address identification information is not unique. If the address identification information passed from the sortation database is unique, the procedure is ended at 115, as indicated by arrow 108, box 115 indicating that a unique address identification number has been determined. At 109, it is determined whether a company is located at the non-unique destination address. If yes, the process is continued at 122, as indicated by arrow 110 the company name being chosen by the operator at 112. If no, the process is continued at 116, as indicated by arrow 111. At 116, an identification for the house or street number is entered so as to determine a unique address identification number which is passed to or from 115 as indicated by arrow 114.”, as required by 37 CFR § 1.84(o) the depicted features of the invention in fig. 9 should be labeled as:

(a) “Enter Zip Code” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 101;

(b) “Enter Street Address” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 102;

(c) “Enter Further Address Data” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 103;

(d) “Unique Address?” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 106;

(e) “N” or NO” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 107;

(f) "Y" or "YES" for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 108;

(g) "Company at Address?" for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 109;

(h) "Y" or "YES" for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 110;

(i) "N" or NO" for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 111;

(j) "Chose Company Name" for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 112;

(k) "Unique Address Determined" for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 115; and

(l) "Enter House/Street Number" for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 116.

(9) as can be seen in figs. 11 & 12, and from the context of the paragraphs located at page 38, lines 3-20, "Fig. 11 is a flow sheet illustration of a first sortation table system. Address information is passed into the system as indicated by arrow 121. The information is passed to a memo table 122 from which a district identification code is determined. The district code is preferably a to digit number. The district code is passed to a primary sortation table from which a destination and/or a discharge station is determined, if possible. If a destination and/or discharge station is determined, the process is continued at 125 where further, optional processing is carried out, and the destination and/or discharge station identification is passed further on as indicated by arrow 126. If a destination and/or discharge station is not determined, the district code is processed at 125 in a secondary sortation table in order to determine a destination and/or discharge station, and the process is continued at 125 as described above. The resulting destination and/or discharge station identification comprises zip code and an address identification number.

Fig. 12 is a flow sheet illustration of a second sortation table system which in addition to the steps indicated in Fig. 11 and described above, comprises determining a sortation pattern code at 127. The resulting destination and/or discharge station identification at 126 comprises group information, distributing route information and sortation pattern information.”, as required by 37 CFR § 1.84(o) in figs. 11 & 12 the depicted features of the invention should be labeled as:

- (a) “Memo Table” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 122;
- (b) “Determine Destination and/or Discharge Station” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 123;
- (c) “Secondary Sortation Table” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 124;
- (d) “Optional Processing” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 125; and
- (e) “Determine Sortation Pattern Code” for the feature of the invention designated by reference number 127.

2.1 Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant

will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

A) applicant must update:

(1) the application data in the paragraph located at page 10, lines 26-30, "In the present application, any item processing installation may comprise a postal item singulating system for singulating items. In particular, a postal item singulating system may comprise the system described and claimed in U.S. provisional patent application filed 29 July 1998 and assigned to the present applicant, the content of which patent application is hereby included the present application.";

with the current status of each of the referenced applications, e.g., --now abandoned--, or --now patent #?--, or --which is abandoned and now serial number #?--, --which is expired--, etc.

B) as required by 37 CFR § 1.84(p(5)) and 37 CFR § 1.121(e) the specification lacks an explicit reference to the nature of:

(1) reference legend(s):

(a) 212, 408, 413 & 414 of fig. 14 as this figure is disclosed in the paragraphs located between page 25, line 9, and page 29, line 15, "Fig. 14 is an illustration of ... as indicated by flash arrow 408."; and

(b) 123 & 124 of figs. 11 & 12 as these figures are disclosed in the paragraphs located at page 38, lines 3-20, "Fig. 11 is a flow sheet illustration of a first ... information and sortation pattern information."

In this regard, it is noted that merely mentioning either a feature or a number with out mentioning the device or operation or number or feature relies on the drawing to provide support for the disclosure and not to aid in the understanding of the invention, as is the purpose of the drawings (37 CFR § 1.81(a,b)).

C) the following errors have been noted in the specification:

(1) applicant's reference to claims 45 & 47 in the paragraph located at page 23, line 10, "a system according to claim 45 and/or a system according to claim 47.", is confusing, since these claims have been cancelled and if the remaining claims were to be allowed then any renumbering of the remaining pending claims that would include claims 45 & 47 would not correspond to the cancelled claims.

(2) applicant has misspelled the word "labelled" in the paragraph located at page 35, lines 7-17, "Fig. 3 is a diagrammatic illustration of the sortation database 58a and an associated computer system. The database itself is [[labelled]] labeled 80, whereas operations being carried during processing of data are illustrated by means of rectangular boxes [[labelled]] labeled 81 , 82, 83 and 84. Processing which is being carried out when no items are being processed is indicated by a box 86. Data are received from the receiving database 55, processed at 82 and passed to the database 80. At 84, zip codes and street names are downloaded to the computer systems 61 , 62, 63, 64 of the control systems of the first and second sortation subsystems. At 83, data are requests for data from the computer systems 61, 62, 63, 64 are received, and responds are passed to those computer systems. At 81, data from the PIB database are received, and addresses are converted to unique address identification codes and passed to the database unit 58b."

(3) as can be seen in fig. 9 and from the context of the paragraph located at page 37, lines 7-21, "At 106, it is determined whether the address identification information passed from the sortation database is unique. If this is not the case, the process is continued at 109, arrow 107 indicating that the address identification information is not unique. If the address identification information passed from the sortation database is unique, the procedure is ended at 115, as indicated by arrow 108, box 115 indicating that a unique address identification number has been determined. At 109, it is determined whether a company is located at the non-unique destination address. If yes, the process is

continued at ~~[[122]]~~ 112, as indicated by arrow 110 the company name being chosen by the operator at 112. If no, the process is continued at 116, as indicated by arrow 111. At 116, an identification for the house or street number is entered so as to determine a unique address identification number which is passed to or from 115 as indicated by arrow 114.”, at line 8 of this paragraph the reference to reference number “122” should be ~~-112--~~, as indicated above. Note also “memo table 122” of fig. 11 as disclosed in the paragraph located at page 38, lines 3-15, “Fig. 11 is a flow sheet illustration of ... passed to a memo table 122 from ... discharge station identification comprises zip code and an address identification number.”.

(4) as can be seen in fig. 11, and from the context of the paragraph located at page 38, lines 3-20, “Fig. 11 is a flow sheet illustration of a first sortation table system. Address information is passed into the system as indicated by arrow 121. The information is passed to a memo table 122 from which a district identification code is determined. The district code is preferably a to digit number. The district code is passed to a primary sortation table from which a destination and/or a discharge station is determined, if possible. If a destination and/or discharge station is determined, the process is continued at 125 where further, optional processing is carried out, and the destination and/or discharge station identification is passed further on as indicated by arrow 126. If a destination and/or discharge station is not determined, the district code is processed at ~~[[125]]~~ 124 in a secondary sortation table in order to determine a destination and/or discharge station, and the process is continued at 125 as described above. The resulting destination and/or discharge station identification comprises zip code and an address identification number.”, at line 10 of this paragraph the reference to reference number “125” should be ~~-124--~~, as indicated above.

(5) the specification lacks a statement of --I claim:--, (see MPEP 608.01(m)).

D) the subject matter of:

(1) claim 76/115/116 the “auto focusing” feature of this claim;

lacks antecedent basis within the specification as required by 37 CFR § 1.75(d1).

Appropriate correction is required.

4. The specification and drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification or drawings. Applicant should note the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.52, 37 CFR § 1.74, § 1.75, § 1.84(o,p(5)), § 1.121(a)-1.121(f) & § 1.121(h)-1.121(i).

5. In regard to the following rejections, a reference to a claim as “76/92” is meant to indicate claim 92 as it is dependent from claim 76.

6. Claims 76-85, 76/92, 94, 76/95, 76/95/96, 97, 76/95/98, 76/99, 76/100, 76/100/101, 76/103, 76/104, 76/105, 76/94/97/106, 76/107, 76/108, 76/108/109, 76/110, 76/110/111, 76/100/112, 76/110/113, 76/108/114, 76/115, 76/115/116, 76/117, 76/118, 76/118/119, 76/117/120, 76/117/121, 76/117/121/122, 76/117/126, 86-91, 86/92, 86/93, 86/95, 86/95/96, 86/95/98, 86/99, 86/100, 86/100/101, 102, 86/102/103, 86/104, 86/105, 86/106, 86/107, 86/108, 86/108/109, 86/110, 86/110/111, 86/110/112, 86/110/113, 86/108/114, 86/115, 86/115/116, 86/117, 86/118, 86/118/119, 86/117/120, 86/117/121, 86/117/121/122, 123-125, 86/117/125, 127, 128, 130, 132, 127/144, 148, 149 & 150 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6.1 In regard to claims 76 & 128, since this claim lacks an act/function that is designated (d i), applicant's designation of an act/function as (d ii) is confusing because it is unclear whether or not there should be an act/function designated as (d i).

6.2 In regard to claims 76-85, 76/92, 94, 76/95, 76/95/96, 97, 76/95/98, 76/99, 76/100, 76/100/101, 76/103, 76/104, 76/105, 76/94/97/106, 76/107, 76/108, 76/108/109, 76/110, 76/110/111, 76/100/112, 76/110/113, 76/108/114, 76/115, 76/115/116, 76/117, 76/118, 76/118/119, 76/117/120, 76/117/121, 76/117/121/122, 76/117/126, 86-91, 86/92, 86/93, 86/95, 86/95/96, 86/95/98, 86/99, 86/100, 86/100/101, 102, 86/102/103, 86/104, 86/105,

Art Unit: 3629

86/106, 86/107, 86/108, 86/108/109, 86/110, 86/110/111, 86/110/112, 86/110/113, 86/108/114, 86/115, 86/115/116, 86/117, 86/118, 86/118/119, 86/117/120, 86/117/121, 86/117/121/122, 123-125, 86/117/125, 127, 128, 130, 132, 127/144, 148, 149 & 150, although one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention would know how to accomplish each of the individual recited actions/functions from the language of these claims, since, there is no clear and definite interconnection between one or more of the recited limitations of these claims, one of ordinary skill could not determine from the language of these claims whether or not they are in fact making and/or using the claimed invention. In this regard it is noted that from the language of these claims it is vague, indefinite and unclear:

A) in regard to claims 76 & 128, and which of the “one or more control systems” or “first system” would perform the processing or comparing acts/functions of the acts/functions (c), (d ii), (e), since one of ordinary skill would have recognized that any one or more of the “control systems” or “first system” may accomplish these acts/functions.

B) in regard to claim 76 & 128, and what is required for an address to be determined as being either “insufficient” or “sufficient” as recited in act/function (d ii), since one of ordinary skill would have recognized that address may contain many different parts, at least some of which would appear in some address while not in other addresses.

C) in regard to claims 76, 86, 128 & 129, and how and from where is the “unique address identification code” generated/created/obtained so that it may be associated with an item as recited in act/function (e), since one of ordinary skill would have recognized that unless the address identification code is either generated/created/obtained from somewhere it may not be associated with an item.

D) in regard to claim 85, and how the “spelling check of at least part of the first address data”, fits in the acts/functions recited in act/function (e) of claim 76, since the outcome of the spell check does not affect the overall operation of the process of claim 76.

E) in regard to claims 76/92 & 86/92 and what are the acts/functions of either (1) steps (e) or (f) of claim 82 in regard to claim 76/92, or claim 76 in regard to claim 86/92, since the invention as recited in this claim does not include either a recitation of the acts/functions of steps (e) or (f) of claim 86 in regard to claim 76/92; or the acts/functions of claim 76 in regard to claim 86/92; or a determination that the acts/functions of steps (e) or (f) of claim 86 have failed of the identification code is not present or un-captureable in regard to claims 76/92 or 86/92.

F) in regard to claims 76/92 & 86/92 and how the first item processing installation claim 76 can be the first item processing installation of claim 86, since the invention as recited in this claim does not include either a recitation of the first item processing installation of claim 86 (claim 76/92) or the first item processing installation of claim 76 (claim 86/92).

G) in regard to claims 94 & 97, and how the “weighing of some items processed by the first installation” (claim 94) or the presentation of the weight to at least one of the first control system (claim 97) , fits in the acts/functions recited in act/function of claim 76, since the outcome of the weighing does not affect the overall operation of the process of claim 76.

H) in regard to claims 76/94/97/106, 76/118, 86/106 & 86/118 and who either the “weight” or “dimensions” of the item may be used to bypass some of the actions/functions of claim 76, since in the invention as set forth in this claim neither (1) dimensions of the item have not been determined, nor (2) the “determined limits” for a item have not been set forth, determined or received by the process of this claim so that the actual values may be compared to the determined limits.

I) in regard to claims 76/95, 76/95/96, 76/95/98, 76/118, 86/95, 86/95/96 & 86/95/98, and how the “volume of some items processed by the first installation” (claims 95-96) or the presentation of the volume to at least one of the first control system (claims 98, 76/118 & 86/118), fits in the acts/functions recited in act/function of claims 76 & 86, since the outcome of the volume determination does not affect the overall operation of the process of claims 76 & 86.

J) in regard to claims 76/97, 76/107, 76/108, 86/99, 86/107 & 86/108, and how the recited acts/functions may be accomplished, since the invention as recited in either claim 76 does not contain an act/function designated as (j).

K) in regard to claim 76/103 & 86/102/103 and where the “modified second address data” originates, since the invention as recited in this claim does not produce, generate or receive any “modified second address data”.

L) in regard to claims 76/108, 76/110, 76/110/111, 76/108/114, 76/117, 76/118, 76/117/120, 76/117/121, 76/117/121/122, 76/117/126, 86/108, 86/110, 86/110/111, 86/108/114, 86/117, 86/118, 86/117/120, 86/117/121, 86/117/121/122 & 86/117/126, and where either the “second control system” or the “third control system” are located, since the invention as recited in claim 76 does not recited either a “second control system” or a “third control system”.

M) in regard to claim 127, and how the “first address signal” may be captured and/or process and/or passed to other means and/or compared and/or displayed, if the “address identification means” from which the “first address signal” is captured is an “OPTIONAL” piece of data placed on an item, that is if the “address identification means” is not present, then it may not be obtained from processing as required by this claim.

N) in regard to claims 76, 127, and how and from where either (1) the “unique address identification code” or (2) error code are generated/created/obtained so that it may be associated with an item as recited in this claim, since one of ordinary skill would have recognized that unless the address identification code or error code are either generated/created/obtained from somewhere it may not be associated with an item.

O) in regard to claim 132, and since the barcode is “provided on all or some of the items then if the bar code is not on one or more items, then how may is be scanned and processed.

P) in regard to claims 148 & 150, and by whom or what are the postal items processed, since the invention as recited in these claims does not include and type of

Art Unit: 3629

means or device that would receive the derived "destination address data" so that the means or device would be controlled by the derived destination address data.

6.3 The subject matter of claim 76/115/116 the "auto focusing" feature of this claim lacks antecedent basis within the specification as required by 37 CFR § 1.75(d1).

6.4 Claims not specifically mentioned above, inherit the defects of the base claim through dependency. For the above reason(s), applicant has failed to particularly point out what is regarded as the invention.

7. 35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".

7.1 Claims 131-143 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

7.1.1 The instant claims recite a method comprising a series of steps to be performed, (claims 131-143), which has a disclosed practical application in the technological or useful arts. Further, the instant claims do not merely define either a computer program, a data structure, non-functional descriptive material, (i.e. mere data) or a natural phenomenon.

7.1.2 In regard to claims 131-143, the invention as set forth in these claims merely describes:

A) in regard to claims 131-143, a process that collects data and processes the data to associated two or more items of data, with out using the results of the processing.

However, the process as recited in these claims does not require the result of either the claim as a whole or the manipulations of data as recited in these claims be applied in any manner so as to be tangibly used in a concrete manner and hence to produce a useful concrete and tangible result, that is a concrete and tangible application with in the technological or useful arts.

7.1.3 It is further noted that applicant has not recited in these claims a specific process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, which is either:

Art Unit: 3629

A) altered or changed or modified by the invention recited in claims; or

B) utilizes the result of the invention recited in these claims; or

C) is operated or controlled by the result of the invention recited in these claims.

7.1.4 It is further noted in regard to claims 131-143, that as claimed applicant has not claimed:

A) pre computer processing, since the claims fail to recited that the data, which originates from an unknown source, is manipulated or transformed/changed before it is processed; or

B) post computer processing, since the claims fail to recited that the data which represents the result of the claimed manipulation, is neither manipulated nor used nor changed by any device after it has been processed; or

C) a practical use of the claimed invention by any physical system or device or method outside of a statement of the intended use of the claimed invention; or

D) process steps or physical acts/operations that would affect the internal operation of a computer/machine as were found to be statutory in either In re McIlroy 170 USPQ 31 (CCPA, 1971) or In re Waldbaum 173 USPQ 430 (CCPA, 1972); or

E) process steps or physical acts/operations that would be considered as going beyond the manipulation of "abstract ideas" as were found to be non-statutory in In re Warmerdam 31 USPQ2d 1754 (CAFC, 1994); or

F) a concrete and tangible practical application of either:

(1) the invention as a whole; or

(2) the final results of the manipulations/actions with in the technological or useful arts;

note In re Sarkar 200 USPQ 132 (CCPA, 1978) where the process step of "constructing said obstruction within the actual open channel at the specified adjusted location indicated by the mathematical model" was held to be so tenuous connected to the remaining process steps as to not be a process with in the scope of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Hence, the invention of claims 131-143 is merely directed to an hypothetical mental exercise that manipulates an abstract idea of manipulating data with out a claimed concrete and tangible

practical application of the abstract idea, (note In re Beauregard 35 USPQ2d 1383 (CAFC 1995) and the associated claims of U.S. Patent 5,710,578; and State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc. 47 USPQ2d 1596 (CAFC 1998)).

7.1.5 It is further noted that the type/nature of either the data or the calculated numbers does not affect the operation of the claimed invention and hence are considered to be non function descriptive material, (note In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

7.1.6 In practical terms, claims define nonstatutory processes if they:

A) consist solely of mathematical operations without some claimed practical application (i.e., executing a “mathematical algorithm”); or

B) simply manipulate abstract ideas, e.g., a bid (Schrader, 22 F.3d at 293-94, 30 USPQ2d at 1458-59) or a bubble hierarchy (Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759),

without some claimed practical application of the mathematics or abstract idea.

7.1.7 In view of the above analysis claims 131-143, as a whole, are directed to an hypothetical mental exercise that merely manipulates mathematics or an abstract idea without a claimed concrete and tangible practical application of the mathematics or abstract idea, and hence are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

7.2 Claims 76-85, 76/92, 94, 76/95, 76/95/96, 97, 76/95/98, 76/99, 76/100, 76/100/101, 76/103, 76/104, 76/105, 76/94/97/106, 76/107, 76/108, 76/108/109, 76/110, 76/110/111, 76/100/112, 76/110/113, 76/108/114, 76/115, 76/115/116, 76/117, 76/118, 76/118/119, 76/117/120, 76/117/121, 76/117/121/122, 76/117/126, 86-91, 86/92, 86/93, 86/95, 86/95/96, 86/95/98, 86/99, 86/100, 86/100/101, 102, 86/102/103, 86/104, 86/105, 86/106, 86/107, 86/108, 86/108/109, 86/110, 86/110/111, 86/110/112, 86/110/113, 86/108/114, 86/115, 86/115/116, 86/117, 86/118, 86/118/119, 86/117/120, 86/117/121, 86/117/121/122, 123-125, 86/117/125, 127, 128, 130, 132, 127/144, 148, 149 & 150 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

7.2.1 As set forth by the Court in:

A) In re Musgrave 167 USPQ 280 at 289-290 (CCPA 1970), “We cannot agree with the Board that these claims (all the steps of which can be carried out by the disclosed apparatus) are directed to non-statutory processes merely because some or all of the steps therein can also be carried out in or with the aid of the human mind or because it may be necessary for one performing the process to think. All that is necessary, in our view, to make a sequence of operational steps a statutory “process” within 35 U.S.C. 101 is that it be in the technological arts so as to be in consonance with the Constitutional purpose to promote the progress of “useful arts.” Cons. Art. 1, sec. 8.”, {emphasis added}; and

B) In re Sarkar 100 USPQ 132 @ 136-137 (CCPA 1978), echoing the Board of Appeals stated in regard to claim 14 “14. A method of locating an obstruction in an open channel to affect flow in a predetermined manner comprising:

a) obtaining the dimensions of said obstruction which affect the parameters of flow;

b) constructing a mathematical model of at least that portion of the open channel in which said obstruction is to be located in accordance with the method of claim 1 using those dimensions obtained in step (a) above;

c) adjusting the location of said obstruction within said mathematical model until the desired effect upon flow is obtained in said model; and thereafter

d) constructing said obstruction within the actual open channel at the specified adjusted location indicated by the mathematical model.”;

and “Concerning claims 14-39 and the significance of “post-solution activity,” like building a bridge or dam, the board concluded: While it is true that the final step in each of these claims makes reference to the mathematical result achieved by performing the prior recited steps, we consider the connection to be so

tenuous that the several steps recited in each claim when considered as a whole do not constitute a proper method under the statute.”, {emphasis added}.

7.2.2 Further, it is noted in regard to claims 14-39 of Sarkar, although step (d) of claim 14 of Sarkar references the result of step (c) of claim 14 of Sarkar it is clear from the language of step (c) of claim 14 of Sarkar that multiple adjustments to the location of the obstruction are required to be made until a location with the desired effect has been determined. Hence, the reference to constructing the obstruction at the “specified adjusted location” in step (d) of claim 14 of Sarkar is vague, indefinite and unclear in regard to which one of the possible multiple adjusted locations of the obstruction that were used during step (c) of claim 14 of Sarkar would be used when constructing the obstruction as required by step (d) of Sarkar. Therefore, without a clear connection between step (d) of Sarkar and the remaining steps of claim 14 of Sarkar, the Board of Appeals and the Court held that these claims were not a process within the meaning of process as used in 35 U.S.C. § 101 and hence were directed to non statutory subject matter.

7.2.3 As can be seen from claims 76-85, 76/92, 94, 76/95, 76/95/96, 97, 76/95/98, 76/99, 76/100, 76/100/101, 76/103, 76/104, 76/105, 76/94/97/106, 76/107, 76/108, 76/108/109, 76/110, 76/110/111, 76/100/112, 76/110/113, 76/108/114, 76/115, 76/115/116, 76/117, 76/118, 76/118/119, 76/117/120, 76/117/121, 76/117/121/122, 76/117/126, 86-91, 86/92, 86/93, 86/95, 86/95/96, 86/95/98, 86/99, 86/100, 86/100/101, 102, 86/102/103, 86/104, 86/105, 86/106, 86/107, 86/108, 86/108/109, 86/110, 86/110/111, 86/110/112, 86/110/113, 86/108/114, 86/115, 86/115/116, 86/117, 86/118, 86/118/119, 86/117/120, 86/117/121, 86/117/121/122, 123-125, 86/117/125, 127, 128, 130, 132, 127/144, 148, 149 & 150, these claims are directed to a series of devices for performing various functions or steps/actions/functions, which as set forth above in regard to the rejection of claims 76-85, 76/92, 94, 76/95, 76/95/96, 97, 76/95/98, 76/99, 76/100, 76/100/101, 76/103, 76/104, 76/105, 76/94/97/106, 76/107, 76/108, 76/108/109, 76/110, 76/110/111, 76/100/112, 76/110/113, 76/108/114, 76/115, 76/115/116, 76/117, 76/118, 76/118/119, 76/117/120, 76/117/121, 76/117/121/122, 76/117/126, 86-91, 86/92, 86/93, 86/95, 86/95/96, 86/95/98, 86/99, 86/100, 86/100/101, 102, 86/102/103, 86/104, 86/105, 86/106, 86/107, 86/108,

Art Unit: 3629

86/108/109, 86/110, 86/110/111, 86/110/112, 86/110/113, 86/108/114, 86/115, 86/115/116, 86/117, 86/118, 86/118/119, 86/117/120, 86/117/121, 86/117/121/122, 123-125, 86/117/125, 127, 128, 130, 132, 127/144, 148, 149 & 150 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 2nd paragraph, are not clearly and definitely interconnected to one another and therefore do not provide an operative useful machine/system or method/process with in the meaning of machine or process as used in 35 U.S.C. § 101.

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(c) Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

8.1 Claims 86-90, 86/92, 93, 86/92, 93, 86/99, 86/100, 86/100/101, 102, 86/102/103, 86/104, 86/105, 86/107, 86/108, 86/108/109, 86/110, 86/110/111, 86/110/112, 86/110/113, 86/108/114, 86/115, 86/115/116, 129 & 131-147, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamada (4,641,753) as interpreted in view of Suda et al (4,388,994).

8.1.1 In regard to claims 86, 87, 89, 90, 86/92, 93, 86/99, 86/100, 86/100/101, 102, 86/102/103, 86/104, 86/105, 86/107, 86/108, 86/108/109, 86/110, 86/110/111, 86/110/112, 86/110/113, 86/108/114, 86/115, 86/115/116, 129 & 131-147, Tamada ('753) discloses a computer implemented mail processing system, which under the control of a set of instruction stored in a computer readable medium, singulates items of mail, that have been collected from one or more departure locations, onto a conveying/transporting system that conveys mail along

a path between a number of different processing stations at a first installation. After the item of mail has been singulated at a first processing station under the control of a first control system, the address information is scanned using a suitable scanning device at a second processing station under the control a second processing system. As the item of mail is conveyed from the second processing station to a third processing station a third control system processes/converts the scanned address information into a “unique address identification code” that as stored ion a database corresponds to the scanned address information from the item of mail so that the third control system may by apply the determined “unique address identification code to the item of mail at the third processing station. Next, the item of mail is conveyed to a fourth processing station where a fourth control system scans/captures the unique address identification code on the item of mail and controls a sorting system to directs the item of mail to its destination/discharge bin/tray as indicated by the “unique address identification code”. It is noted at this time that as taught by Suda et al (‘994) the sorting process of Tamada (‘753) comprises at least one sorting process and may in fact be a series of different sorting processes as the “unique address identification code” is scanned so that the item of mail may be sorted to a finer level than the previous level of sorting until the item mail is delivered to it’s destination.

8.1.2 In regard to claim 88, it is noted that if the scanned address information can not be automatically converted by the system of Tamada (‘753), then the item of mail is forward to a manual processing system for manual coding of the “unique address identification code”.

8.1.3 In regard to claim 86/115/116, since it is noted that an blurry out of focus image would not lend itself to automated processing, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention, that the scanners/readers of Tamada (‘753) as interpreted in view of Suda et al (‘994) would include a suitable method/means for focus on the item of mail so as to properly read/scan the address information.

8.2 Claims 91, 86/117, 86/117/120, 86/117/121, 86/117/121/122, 125, 86/117/126 & 148-150 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamada (4,641,753) as interpreted in view of Suda et al (4,388,994) as applied to claims 86 & 89 and further in view of Tuttle (2004/0246099).

Art Unit: 3629

8.2.1 In regard to claims 91, 86/117, 86/117/120, 86/117/121, 86/117/121/122, 125 & 86/117/126, Tamada ('753) as interpreted in view of Suda et al ('994) does not disclose the use of an RF tag to replace the barcode applied in Tamada ('753) as interpreted in view of Suda et al ('994), however, in the environment of postage metering and tracking, Tuttle ('099) discloses the structure of an RF id tag that may be used to stored postage related data and track items of mail as they are processed. Since the tag of Tuttle ('099) would reduce some of the errors and problems associated with optically scanning and using OCR to convert the address information into the "unique address identification code" of Tamada ('753) as interpreted in view of Suda et al ('994), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention, that the barcode of Tamada ('753) as interpreted in view of Suda et al ('994) could be replaced by the RF tag containing the same information with the optical scanners and readers being replaced by devices to read RF tags as taught by Tuttle ('099).

8.3 Claim 86/106 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamada (4,641,753) as interpreted in view of Suda et al (4,388,994) as applied to claim 86 and further in view of Zucker et al (3,861,480).

8.3.1 In regard to claim 86/106, Tamada ('753) as interpreted in view of Suda et al ('994) does not disclose rejecting/bypassing an item of mail based on weight, however, in the environment of postage metering and mail processing Zucker et al ('480) discloses that in an automated mail processing system for processing mixed items of mail by conveying the items of mail from one processing station to the next processing station rejection, that is bypassing one or more automatic processing stations if the item of mail is oversized/weight so that it may be manually processed. Since an item of mail that is too large/heavy to be correctly processed by an automatic mail processing system would affect the operation of the automatic mail processing system, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention, that the mail processing system of Tamada ('753) as interpreted in view of Suda et al ('994) could be modified to reject any item of mail that is too big or heavy to be automatically processed as taught by Zucker et al ('480).

9. The following is an Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance over the prior art:

Art Unit: 3629

A) in regard to claims 76, 127, the prior art does not teach or suggest a mail processing and sorting system, in which after an item of mail has been singulated and feed to a scanner station where the address data is scanned, the scanned address data is first checked to determine if it is sufficient to generate a routing code. Where if the data is sufficient, then an unique address code is associated with the item, where the unique address code is obtained by using the scanned address data to access a database. And where if the address is sufficient and not in the data base, then an error code is associated with the item of mail. However, if the scanned address data is insufficient, then the address data is scanned a second time and the first or second address data is converted to third address data which is the assigned to be the first address data and then checked for sufficiency as above. Claims 77-85, 76/92, 94, 76/95, 76/95/96, 97, 76/95/98, 76/99, 76/100, 76/100/101, 76/103, 76/104, 76/105, 76/94/97/106, 76/107, 76/108, 76/108/109, 76/110, 76/110/111, 76/100/112, 76/110/113, 76/108/114, 76/115, 76/115/116, 76/117, 76/118, 76/118/119, 76/117/120, 76/117/121, 76/117/121/122, 76/117/126, 128, 130 & 127/144 are allowable for the same reason.

B) in regard to claims 86/95, 86/95, 96, 86/95/98, the prior art does not teach or suggest the system which determines the volume of the item of mail.

C) in regard to claims 86/118, 86/118/119, the prior art does not teach or suggest the system which provides the volume and weight of an item of mail to a accounting computer and database.

10. The examiner has cited prior art of interest, for example:

A) either Sautton (FR 2255966) or Nakano (JP 05-324672) or Marshall or Knowles et al (5,869,819) or Monico (6,557,758) or Latta (6,674,038) disclose the use of an scanning device in an automated mail processing system to read encoded information from an item in order to control the routing of the item of mail through the automated mail processing system from the point of entry until the delivery of the item at it's destination. Where:

(1) in Sautton ('966) the scanner is a video coding device; and

(2) in either Nakano ('672) or Knowles et al ('819) or Monico ('758) the barcode that is used to route an item of mail contains information that is used to track an item of mail through the delivery process; and

(3) in Monico ('758) an RF scanner is used to detect and read data from a RF id tag on an item of mail and these used the obtained data to rout and track the item of mail through the delivery process.

B) the One to One article discloses that the routing barcodes may be applied before the item enters the delivery stream.

11. Applicant must supply the prior art, for example:

A) the article mentioned in the paragraph located at page 8, lines 18-21, "In all aspects of the invention, the identification code may comprise a radio frequency tag. In the present application, the term "radio frequency tag" or "frequency tag" may, e.g., comprise a micro chip as described in "Ein Mikrochip fuhrt den Reisekoffer sicher ans Ziel" by Manuela Stabagv in "Welt der Wissenschaft", 27 December 1995 issue."

B) the Danish patent application No. PA 1 998 00997 as mentioned in the paragraph located at page 11, lines 1-5, "Any item processing installation, in particular the first item processing installation may comprise a postal item check-in system. In the present application, such a postal item check-in system may comprise a system as described and claimed in Danish patent application No. PA 1 998 00997, the content of which patent application is hereby included in the present application."

C) the publication of PCT/DK98/00586 as mentioned in the paragraph located at page 24, lines 1-8, "All or some of the discharge stations may comprise a chute. All or some of the chutes may comprise a pater noster system rearranging and circulating a plurality of items during the process of sorting a plurality of items at the sorting conveyor. The pater noster system may comprise a conveyor which is capable of conveying and/or recirculating items in a horizontal and/or in a vertical plane. The conveyor may, e.g., comprise tilt trays or cross bells for carrying and unloading items. The pater noster system may, e.g., be based on the invention of international application No. PCT/DK98/00586."

Art Unit: 3629

12. The shorten statutory period of response is set to expire 3 (three) months from the mailing date of this Office action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Cosimano whose telephone number is (703) 305-9783 (after 13 April 2005 (571) 272-6802). The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30am to 6:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss, can be reached on (703)-308-2702 (after 13 April 2005 (571) 272-6812). Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

13.1 The fax phone number for UNOFFICIAL/DRAFT FAXES is (703) 746-7240.

13.2 The fax phone number for OFFICIAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.

13.3 The fax phone number for AFTER FINAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.

03/09/05



Edward R. Cosimano
Primary Examiner A.U. 3629